Belief as Infrastructure: A Unified Theory of Scaled Domination Without Proportional Coercion

An Introduction to the Analytical Framework

Thomas J. Bryan

Abstract

This paper introduces a theoretical framework for understanding how small elite groups maintain sustained control over vastly larger populations without proportional coercive capacity. The central argument is that scaled domination depends fundamentally on **information asymmetry**—the elite's claim to possess knowledge the population lacks, combined with mechanisms preventing verification of that claim and suppressing competing claims. Religious systems, sacred narratives, and legitimating ideologies function not as epiphenomena of power but as its essential infrastructure, generating voluntary compliance that coercion alone could never achieve. The framework synthesizes insights from historical materialism, elite theory, and comparative religion to explain why identical structural patterns appear across geographically isolated civilizations—not through cultural diffusion but through convergent evolution toward optimal solutions to a universal problem. This introduction establishes the theoretical foundations for a series of case studies examining how belief systems are constructed, maintained, challenged, and transformed across diverse historical contexts.

I. The Puzzle: The Arithmetic of Domination

The central puzzle of human social organization is deceptively simple: How do small groups maintain sustained control over vastly larger populations?

Consider the arithmetic. Throughout recorded history, ruling elites have typically comprised a tiny fraction of total population—rarely more than one or two percent. The remaining ninety-eight or ninety-nine percent possess overwhelming numerical superiority. They grow the food. They build the structures. They vastly outnumber any military or police force. In principle, they could simply refuse compliance. They could stop working, stop paying tribute, stop accepting

commands. No elite could physically coerce an entire population into submission if that population collectively refused.

Yet populations largely comply. Across millennia, across continents, across radically different cultural contexts, the pattern holds: large populations accept the authority of small elites, work to produce surplus that elites extract, follow rules elites establish, and reproduce the very systems that subordinate them. The question is not why occasional rebellions occur—given the numerical asymmetry, the surprise is that they are so rare. The question is why sustained, routine compliance is the historical norm.

The answer cannot be pure coercion. Physical force at scale faces insurmountable practical constraints. You cannot station a guard over every worker, a soldier in every home, an overseer monitoring every task. The personnel required for comprehensive coercion would exceed available population. Guards require payment, food, housing, and equipment—all drawn from the surplus they are meant to secure. As the population to be controlled grows, enforcement costs compound faster than extraction capacity. Coercive systems exhibit poor scaling properties.

Moreover, coercion generates resistance. Populations subjected to naked force develop resentment, seek opportunities for sabotage, and remain perpetually poised for rebellion when circumstances permit. Sustained rule through pure violence is exhausting, expensive, and unstable. History's most durable systems of domination have never relied primarily on force.

There must be another mechanism—one that generates compliance without proportional enforcement, that induces populations to accept their subordination as legitimate, natural, or inevitable, and that reproduces itself across generations without constant elite intervention.

That mechanism is **belief**.

II. Information Asymmetry: The Core Mechanism

The framework advanced in this collection centers on a concept we term **information asymmetry**: the systematic creation and maintenance of a gap between what elites claim to know and what ordinary populations can verify.

The mechanism operates as follows. Elites claim to possess privileged access to important knowledge—knowledge that the population lacks and cannot independently acquire. This knowledge might concern divine will, cosmic order, historical laws, natural principles, or technical complexities beyond ordinary comprehension. The specific content varies across cultures and periods, but the structural position is constant: elites assert that they know something crucial that you do not.

If this claim is believed, domination transforms from arbitrary imposition into legitimate authority. The population complies not because they fear punishment but because they accept that the elite's commands reflect genuine knowledge about how the world works, what the gods demand, or what society requires. Obedience becomes rational deference to those who know better. Extraction becomes contribution to cosmic order. Hierarchy becomes natural arrangement rather than political choice.

Three conditions must hold for information asymmetry to function effectively:

First, the claimed knowledge must be structurally unverifiable by ordinary people. If the population could easily check whether the elite's claims are true, the asymmetry would collapse. Therefore, the most effective forms of elite knowledge concern matters that ordinary verification cannot reach: the will of invisible gods, the nature of an afterlife no living person has witnessed, the workings of complex systems beyond direct observation, the requirements of cosmic order that transcend individual experience.

Second, the elite must maintain monopoly over interpretation. If multiple individuals can claim access to the privileged knowledge, competition among claimants allows the population to compare claims, observe contradictions, and potentially conclude that no one possesses genuine special access. Therefore, systems of information asymmetry include mechanisms for suppressing or delegitimizing competing claims—declaring rival claimants heretics, false prophets, charlatans, or madmen.

Third, the population must be socialized to accept the asymmetry as legitimate. Children must be raised to believe that certain authorities possess knowledge worth deferring to. This socialization occurs through family, education, ritual, and the entire apparatus of cultural reproduction. By the time individuals reach adulthood, the information asymmetry feels natural—simply how the world works—rather than a constructed arrangement serving particular interests.

When these conditions hold, domination becomes largely self-maintaining. The population polices itself, reports deviance, pressures dissenters to conform, and transmits belief to the next generation. The elite need only maintain the institutional apparatus of knowledge monopoly—temples, schools, credentialing systems, interpretive hierarchies—and intervene coercively only against the occasional challenger who threatens to expose the mechanism.

III. Why Religious Claims Represent the Historical Optimum

Across human history, claims to **divine knowledge**—communication with gods, access to sacred revelation, understanding of cosmic order—have proven the most effective form of

information asymmetry for sustaining domination. This is not accidental but reflects structural advantages that religious claims possess over alternatives.

Absolute Unverifiability

Divine knowledge is perfectly unverifiable by ordinary means. A population might eventually develop methods to check technical claims or evaluate historical predictions, but they cannot verify whether someone genuinely communicates with God. The deity either exists in a supernatural realm beyond empirical verification or is understood as transcendent truth accessible only through special revelation. Either way, ordinary verification is impossible by definition.

This makes religious claims more durable than other forms of elite knowledge. When Marxist regimes claimed knowledge of historical laws and predicted workers' paradise, the predictions could eventually be checked against observable reality. When theocratic systems claim knowledge of God's will, no empirical evidence can definitively refute the claim. The sacred realm is structured to be beyond verification.

Ultimate Stakes

Divine knowledge concerns not merely earthly welfare but eternal salvation or cosmic order. This raises the stakes of compliance beyond any temporal calculation. A peasant might risk punishment for refusing to pay taxes if the immediate costs seem tolerable. But risking eternal damnation, cosmic catastrophe, or permanent spiritual degradation represents a qualitatively different calculation.

Religious framing transforms mundane rule-following into existential necessity. Failing to comply with elite demands becomes not merely illegal or imprudent but cosmically dangerous—threatening not just individual welfare but potentially the stability of the universe itself.

Self-Perpetuation Through Child-Rearing

Religious belief systems embed themselves in child-rearing practices, creating self-perpetuating cycles that require minimal elite intervention. Parents teach children to believe because parents genuinely believe (having been taught by their parents), creating authentic conviction across generations without requiring continuous elite coordination beyond maintaining educational and ritual apparatus.

Children raised within a belief system do not experience it as imposed ideology but as obvious truth about reality. By adulthood, the beliefs feel like direct perception rather than learned interpretation. The elite need not convince each generation anew; they need only ensure the transmission mechanisms continue operating.

Interpretive Flexibility

Sacred texts and divine revelations are typically ambiguous enough to allow interpretation that serves elite interests under varying circumstances, while rigid enough to maintain doctrinal authority. When conditions change, elites can "discover" new interpretations of ancient wisdom that justify new policies. The texts remain unchanged (preserving legitimacy through continuity), but their meaning adapts to serve current elite needs.

This flexibility-within-continuity allows religious legitimation to persist across dramatically different social conditions. The same scripture can legitimate feudalism, monarchy, capitalism, or socialism depending on interpretation. The sacred text provides the anchor of legitimacy while interpretation provides adaptability.

IV. The Coordination Problem: Political and Interpretive Elites

Information asymmetry-based domination typically requires coordination between two distinct elite groups, each possessing resources the other lacks.

Political elites control military force, administrative apparatus, tax collection, legal systems, and resource distribution. They can seize territory, defeat rivals, and punish disobedience. But they typically lack direct claim to sacred knowledge, cannot generate ideological legitimacy independently, and struggle to maintain compliance without constant coercive expenditure.

Interpretive elites—priests, scholars, theologians, credentialed experts—control access to sacred texts and their authoritative interpretation, educational institutions transmitting knowledge to new generations, ritual practices confirming cosmic order, and the ideological frameworks that legitimate or delegitimate rulers. But they lack military force to defend their institutions, administrative capacity to extract resources at scale, and coercive power to suppress competing interpretations without political backing.

Neither group can dominate effectively alone. Political elites who seize power through force cannot maintain it efficiently without ideological legitimation. Interpretive elites who claim sacred authority cannot defend their position without political protection. This mutual dependency creates natural alliance:

Political elites provide military protection for religious institutions, legal enforcement of orthodoxy, suppression of competing interpretive claims, material support for the priestly class, and validation of their social status.

Interpretive elites provide legitimation of political authority as divinely ordained, maintenance of belief systems ensuring population compliance, educational apparatus socializing each generation, ritual validation of political decisions, and delegitimation of alternative power claims.

This coordination creates a powerful feedback loop: political authority protects religious authority, which legitimates political authority, which enables resource extraction, which funds both political and religious institutions, which reinforces the belief system, which generates compliance, which reduces enforcement costs, which frees resources for expansion.

Yet the relationship contains inherent tension. If priests can declare a ruler illegitimate, they possess leverage that constrains political authority. If rulers can withdraw protection or suppress religious institutions, they possess leverage over interpretive elites. The relationship is simultaneously cooperative (both benefit) and competitive (each would prefer more independence). This tension produces recurring conflicts throughout history over who ultimately controls the legitimating narrative—conflicts whose outcomes depend on material factors rather than theological merit.

V. The "Final Prophet" Pattern: Defending Information Monopoly

One of the most revealing patterns across religious systems is the emergence of doctrines declaring that revelation is complete—that the current prophet, text, or teaching is final and no further divine communication is expected or legitimate. This pattern appears across traditions:

In Judaism, prophecy ends with the canonical Hebrew Bible; later claimants are false prophets by definition. In Christianity, the New Testament completes revelation and the canon closes. In Islam, Muhammad is the "Seal of the Prophets" (*Khatam al-Nabiyyin*); no legitimate prophets can follow. Similar patterns appear in traditions from Manichaeism to various Hindu and Buddhist lineages.

The consistency of this pattern demands explanation. Why do religious systems tend toward declaring revelation complete rather than remaining open to ongoing divine communication?

The answer lies in information monopoly defense. Each new claimant to divine communication represents a potential competitor who could declare, "God just told me something different from what established authorities claim." If the channel of divine communication remains open, anyone could potentially access it and make competing claims to privileged knowledge. This would destroy the information asymmetry that makes religious authority valuable for social control.

By declaring revelation complete and sealed, established interpretive elites accomplish several objectives simultaneously. They protect their monopoly, as no new claimants can arise with legitimate divine authority. They preserve existing texts and interpretations as the only source of divine knowledge. They secure their institutional role as the sole authorized interpreters of the completed revelation. They eliminate competition, as new prophets can be dismissed as false by definition. And they maintain the information asymmetry that sustains their position.

This explains why religious authorities across traditions have systematically persecuted, suppressed, or executed individuals claiming new divine revelation—not primarily because the theology differs (theological disputes are manageable within established frameworks) but because the new prophet breaks the information monopoly by claiming independent access to divine knowledge.

VI. Convergent Evolution: Why the Pattern Appears Everywhere

A central claim of this framework is that identical structural patterns appear across geographically isolated civilizations not through cultural diffusion but through **convergent evolution**—independent discovery of similar solutions to the same underlying problem.

The evidence for convergent evolution rather than diffusion is substantial. We find the same mechanisms appearing in:

- Ancient Mesopotamia and Mesoamerica, separated by oceans and millennia with no possibility of contact
- Vedic India and Norse Scandinavia, developing in complete isolation from each other
- China and the Andes, with distinct linguistic, technological, and cultural traditions
- Polynesian societies across the Pacific, developing similar sacred chief systems independently on isolated island groups

These civilizations had no means of sharing ideas about how to construct legitimating belief systems. Yet they independently developed narratives that delegitimize non-agricultural alternatives, naturalize class hierarchy as cosmic or biological necessity, frame surplus extraction as divine obligation, and threaten collective resistance with existential catastrophe.

The convergence results from narrow solution space constrained by material realities. Any group seeking to extract surplus from a larger population at scale faces identical structural constraints. Pure coercion scales poorly. Some mechanism must generate voluntary compliance. Claims to privileged knowledge accomplish this more efficiently than alternatives. Among possible claims, those concerning unverifiable sacred matters prove most durable.

Given these constraints, the range of workable solutions is limited. Just as evolution produces similar body forms (eyes, wings, streamlined shapes) across unrelated species facing similar environmental pressures, social evolution produces similar legitimation systems across unrelated civilizations facing similar political pressures. The specific content varies—different gods, different creation myths, different sacred texts—but the structural function remains constant.

This convergent evolution framework has important implications. It means we cannot explain belief systems through cultural particularity alone. We cannot say that Mesopotamians developed divine kingship because of something essential to Mesopotamian culture, when Polynesians developed remarkably similar systems in complete isolation. The pattern points to structural necessity rather than cultural choice.

VII. Material Conditions Determine Belief: Causation Runs from Power to Ideology

A critical component of this framework concerns the direction of causation between power and belief. The conventional view, implicit in much religious and intellectual history, holds that populations come to believe certain things through persuasion, cultural evolution, or spiritual development, and that these beliefs then shape political and social arrangements. In this view, ideas are primary; power arrangements follow.

The framework advanced here reverses this causation. **Material conditions—specifically, which elite faction possesses superior military and political power—determine which belief system becomes dominant.** Populations do not adopt belief systems because those systems are more persuasive or spiritually compelling. They adopt them because the faction promoting those beliefs won the relevant military and political conflicts, seized control of educational and socialization institutions, and used state power to suppress alternatives while promoting their preferred ideology.

The evidence for this reversed causation is abundant:

Germany after 1945 split along occupation lines. West Germany, occupied by Western powers, developed liberal democratic institutions and capitalist ideology. East Germany, occupied by the Soviet Union, developed Marxist-Leninist institutions and communist ideology. The populations were culturally identical before division. The ideological divergence followed directly from which military power controlled which territory. Within a generation, East Germans and West Germans held genuinely different beliefs about politics, economics, and social organization—not because one ideology was more persuasive but because different occupying powers controlled the socialization apparatus.

Japan's State Shinto collapsed immediately upon military defeat in 1945. An ideology that had seemed deeply embedded in Japanese culture, essential to Japanese identity, and fervently believed by the population simply evaporated when the American occupation required its abandonment. This suggests that what appeared as deep cultural belief was actually dependent on state power to maintain it.

Protestant-Catholic distribution across Europe maps political victories, not theological persuasion. Regions became Protestant where Protestant princes won military and political

struggles; regions remained Catholic where Catholic powers retained control. The population of a territory adopted the religion of their ruler (*cuius regio, eius religio*) not through theological conversion but through the socialization apparatus that victorious powers controlled.

This framework does not claim that populations are cynically manipulated or that belief is mere pretense. The populations of West Germany, East Germany, Protestant England, and Catholic Spain genuinely believed their respective ideologies. Children raised within these systems experienced their beliefs as obvious truths about reality. The point is that which beliefs became available for genuine adoption depended on which faction controlled the territory and its institutions.

The implication is significant: debates about the relative truth or merit of competing belief systems may be largely irrelevant to explaining their actual distribution. What matters is power—who controls the apparatus of cultural reproduction.

VIII. The Transformation Paradox: Why Liberation Becomes Oppression

One of the most striking patterns in history is how movements that begin by challenging established information asymmetry tend to recreate similar asymmetries once they gain power. Revolutionary Christianity challenged Roman religious hierarchies but became the imperial religion enforcing orthodoxy with state violence. Protestant movements challenged Catholic interpretive monopoly but created their own denominational authorities burning heretics. Communist parties challenged capitalist ideological control but established their own orthodoxies enforced by secret police. The pattern recurs with remarkable consistency.

This transformation paradox reflects structural logic rather than moral failure. Any movement that successfully challenges established authority and gains power faces the same fundamental problem that created information asymmetry originally: How do you maintain control over large populations without proportional coercion?

Revolutionary movements initially attract followers by promising liberation from elite interpretive monopoly. They declare that ordinary people can access truth directly—can read scripture themselves, can understand historical laws, can participate in governance without intermediaries. These claims resonate because they are often accurate: established elites do maintain information monopoly for material benefit.

But once the revolutionary movement gains power, it discovers that pure democracy of interpretation produces chaos, fragmentation, and inability to coordinate action. If anyone can claim authoritative understanding of the revolutionary doctrine, the movement splinters into competing factions unable to implement any coherent program. Meanwhile, counter-revolutionary forces exploit the disorganization.

The movement therefore faces a choice: maintain ideological openness and risk organizational collapse, or establish authoritative interpretation and recreate information asymmetry. Most successful revolutionary movements choose the latter, though often gradually and unconsciously. They close the interpretation of revolutionary texts, establishing which readings are correct. They create hierarchies determining who can authoritatively interpret doctrine. They suppress deviation, eliminating or marginalizing competing interpretations within the movement. They coordinate interpretive authority with political and military control. They make challenges to established interpretation into crimes against the revolution.

The result is a new elite claiming privileged access to truth—revolutionary doctrine rather than divine revelation, scientific history rather than sacred text—with institutional mechanisms suppressing competing claims, coordinating with political power, and extracting resources from the population. The content changes but the structure remains.

IX. Modern Secular Variants: Continuity of Mechanism

The transition from religious to secular societies does not eliminate information asymmetry as a mechanism of domination—it transforms the content while preserving the function.

Modern expert classes claim privileged access to important knowledge just as priestly classes once did. Economists claim to understand market dynamics that ordinary citizens cannot grasp. Public health officials claim to know what behaviors promote or threaten collective welfare. Climate scientists claim to understand earth systems beyond lay comprehension. Technology experts claim to understand digital systems that structure daily life.

These claims may have stronger epistemic foundations than religious claims—empirical methods provide verification mechanisms that divine revelation lacks. But the structural position is similar. Populations cannot personally verify complex technical claims. They must trust credentialed experts or live in perpetual uncertainty. Experts maintain interpretive monopoly through credentialing systems, peer review, institutional gatekeeping, and dismissal of non-credentialed challengers as unqualified to speak.

The coordination between technical experts and political power mirrors historical patterns between priests and kings. Experts legitimate political decisions by providing technical justification. Politicians protect expert institutions through funding and legal authority. Together they manage challenges from populations who question expert consensus—dismissing such challenges as ignorance, conspiracy thinking, or dangerous populism.

This is not to claim that modern expertise is equivalent to religious authority or that scientific knowledge has no greater validity than theological doctrine. The point is structural: the *mechanism* by which expert knowledge legitimates political authority and generates compliance operates similarly to historical religious legitimation. Understanding this continuity helps explain why challenges to expert authority in modern societies trigger responses structurally similar to

responses against religious heresy in earlier periods—not burning at the stake, but professional destruction, social exclusion, and institutional delegitimation.

X. The Case Studies: Empirical Examination

The theoretical framework outlined above generates specific predictions that can be tested against historical evidence. The case studies collected in this volume examine diverse instances of belief system construction, maintenance, challenge, and transformation:

"Belief as Infrastructure" examines creation myths and origin narratives across nine geographically isolated civilizations—Mesopotamia, ancient Israel, Vedic India, China, Norse/Germanic societies, Maya, Aztec, Inca, and Muisca—demonstrating that the same four mechanisms appear independently despite zero cultural contact. This convergence confirms that we are observing structural necessity rather than cultural coincidence.

"The Pacific Confirmation" analyzes Hawaiian kapu and the independent discovery of belief infrastructure across Polynesia, with particular attention to the 1819 elite-initiated abolition that revealed the system's political rather than cosmic function.

"The Puritan Dilemma" examines what happens when a legitimating ideology undermines its own information asymmetry. Puritanism declared that believers could interpret scripture themselves, yet Puritan magistrates needed to maintain interpretive monopoly to govern. The resulting contradiction generated perpetual crisis, visible in the trials of Anne Hutchinson and other dissenters.

"The Latter-Day Saints" traces alternative elite formation and strategic accommodation in nineteenth-century America. Mormons built parallel sovereignty structures that threatened federal authority and triggered suppression. They survived through strategic surrender—abandoning what threatened state power while preserving core institutional authority—demonstrating how alternative institutions can persist by transforming from competitive to complementary.

"Nation of Islam" examines racial inversion theology and the limits of accommodation available to movements emerging from marginalized populations without geographic isolation or structural leverage.

"Paramahansa Yogananda and the Self-Realization Fellowship" analyzes reverse cultural extraction—taking religious capital from colonized India and marketing it to American audiences through non-threatening synthesis with Christianity and science.

"How Constantine's Synthesis Created Western Divergence" explains why Western civilization developed distinctively through the accidental creation of dual legitimating infrastructure—Judeo-Christian and Greco-Roman paths competing and coexisting—enabling

the scientific revolution and industrial development through structural features absent in single-tradition civilizations.

Each case study applies the theoretical framework to specific historical circumstances, testing whether the mechanisms identified operate as predicted and revealing the particular dynamics that emerge in different contexts.

XI. Methodological Considerations

The framework advanced here requires analytical approaches distinct from conventional intellectual history or religious studies:

Focus on structure over content. The specific theological or ideological content of belief systems matters less than their structural position in generating compliance and legitimating authority. Whether elites claim knowledge of Marduk's will or Marx's laws, the analytical question concerns how that claim functions to maintain information asymmetry.

Attention to material interests. Every analysis must ask: What do interpretive elites gain from their position? What would they lose if information monopoly ended? How do these interests shape their behavior? The assumption is that institutional position shapes action regardless of subjective belief.

Tracking coordination mechanisms. How do political and interpretive elites coordinate their authority? What bargains are struck? How are conflicts between them managed? The relationship between these elite groups is never simply cooperative but involves ongoing negotiation.

Evidence of suppression. What happens to competing claimants to privileged knowledge? Through what mechanisms are they eliminated or delegitimized? The treatment of challengers reveals the mechanisms by which information monopoly is defended.

Following the pattern across transformations. How does the mechanism persist when specific content changes? When divine-right monarchy becomes constitutional democracy, when religious authority becomes scientific expertise, what continuities exist through apparent revolutions?

This approach does not require proving that any specific prophet, priest, or expert is consciously lying. It requires only observing that claims to privileged knowledge are made, that these claims are structurally unverifiable, that institutional mechanisms suppress competing claims, that material benefits accrue to those controlling information monopoly, and that the pattern recurs across contexts with different content.

XII. Conclusion: The Visibility of the Invisible

The framework presented here reveals a mechanism that operates most effectively when invisible. Populations do not experience themselves as being ruled through controlled interpretation. They experience their deference as rational acceptance of legitimate authority. The trials of heretics appear as defense of truth, not maintenance of power. The suppression of alternatives appears as protection of the community, not elimination of competition.

When the mechanism works well, it disappears from view. People simply believe what they have been taught to believe, defer to authorities they have been trained to trust, and cannot imagine that the entire system serves interests other than their own.

Yet the mechanism becomes visible in moments of breakdown—when ideologies undermine their own information asymmetry, when elite-initiated abolition reveals belief systems as political technology, when competing factions expose each other's instrumentalization of sacred claims. In such moments, attentive observers can see what is usually hidden: that belief systems are constructed technologies serving material functions, that interpretive classes have institutional interests in maintaining their position, that theological and ideological conflicts often conceal material struggles over information monopoly.

The case studies that follow examine such moments of visibility, tracing how belief infrastructures are built, defended, challenged, and transformed. The goal is not to debunk any particular belief system or to claim that all religious or ideological claims are false. It is to understand the *mechanism*—the structural logic by which claims to privileged knowledge enable scaled domination—so that this mechanism becomes visible even when it is operating effectively.

Understanding the mechanism does not automatically dissolve its power. Populations cannot simply decide to stop believing once they understand that belief serves elite interests. But understanding does open possibilities for different questions: not "which belief system is true?" but "whose interests does this belief system serve?" Not "what does the sacred text really mean?" but "who benefits from this interpretation prevailing?" Not "why do people believe false things?" but "what material conditions produced this particular configuration of belief?"

These questions structure the investigations that follow.

© 2026 Thomas J. Bryan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.